Interview Summary

Application No.

09/766,209

PASSANISI, BRANDON J.

Examiner

Art Unit

Tuan A. Vu

2193

	Tuan A. Vu	2193	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):			
(1) <u>Tuan A. Vu</u> .	(3)		
(2) Robert Lord.	(4)		
Date of Interview: 23 May 2006.			
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2	2) applicant's representative	;]	
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e) <u>□</u> No.		
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1</u> .			
Identification of prior art discussed: n/a.			
Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reached. g)☐ was not reached. h)☐ N	I/A.	
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>			
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)			
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.			
	Lundon	f al	
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an	Jum An	NUL	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-413 (Rev. 04-03)

Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Application No. 09/766,209

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative was approach for the purpose of having Examiner's suggested changes effectuated into the claim so that the claim will make the invention more distinct over the prior art, thus increase its condition for allowance. The added elements being suggested and agreed upon for amending the claim was about adding the syntax and description field to the creation of the manifest file and header. These changes would raise the subject matter of claims 1, 11, and 18 to a much improved state for allowance pending securing other type of form deficiencies.